

Topics in Electroweak Physics

A. Sirlin^{a*}

^aDepartment of Physics, New York University,
4 Washington Place, NY 10003, United States

We briefly discuss five topics in Precision Electroweak Physics: i) the recently proposed Effective Scheme of Renormalization, ii) evidence for electroweak bosonic corrections derived from the radiative correction Δr_{eff} , iii) an approach to estimate the scale of new physics in a hypothetical Higgs-less scenario, iv) simple and accurate formulae for s_{eff}^2 , M_W , Γ_t , and their physical applications, v) a recent proposal concerning the field renormalization constant for unstable particles.

1. Effective Scheme of Renormalization

Precise calculations in the Standard Model (SM) are based on a number of renormalization frameworks. Two of the most frequently employed are: 1) the On-Shell Scheme (OS) [1–3] 2) the $\overline{MS}$ approach [4]. The OS scheme is “very physical” in the sense that the renormalized parameters are identified with physical, scale-independent observables, such as α , G_F , M_Z , M_W , ... The $\overline{MS}$ approach is frequently applied in a hybrid version, with couplings defined by $\overline{MS}$ subtractions, but retaining physical masses. It employs scale-dependent parameters such as $\hat{s}^2 \equiv \sin^2 \hat{\theta}(\mu)$, $\hat{e}^2(\mu)$ (usually evaluated at $\mu = M_Z$) and exhibits very good convergence properties [5]. It plays an important rôle in the analysis of Grand Unified Theories. However, it leads to a residual scale dependence in finite orders of perturbation theory (PT). Very recently, a novel approach, called the Effective Scheme of Renormalization (EFF), was proposed [6,7]. It shares the good convergence properties of the $\overline{MS}$ scheme, but it eliminates the residual scale dependence in finite orders of PT. A distinguishing feature is that the basic electroweak mixing parameter (EWMP) is directly identified with $s_{eff}^2 \equiv \sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$, employed by the Electroweak Working Group (EWWG) to describe the on-resonance asymmetries measured at LEP and

SLC. It may be evaluated by means of the basic relation [6–8]

$$s_{eff}^2 c_{eff}^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2} G_F M_Z^2 (1 - \Delta r_{eff})}, \quad (1)$$

where Δr_{eff} is the relevant radiative correction. In order to calculate Δr_{eff} the following strategy was followed:

i) Since current calculations of s_{eff}^2 incorporate two-loop effects enhanced by powers $(M_t^2/M_Z^2)^n$ (with $n = 1, 2$), we first express Δr_{eff} in terms of corrections $\Delta \hat{r}_W$, $\Delta \hat{\rho}$, $\Delta \hat{k}$ and $\hat{f}$, for which the irreducible contributions of this order have been evaluated [9,10]. ii) To ensure the absence of a residual scale dependence, we use scale-independent couplings, such as e^2 , s_{eff}^2 , G_F , M_Z^2 , retain only two-loop effects enhanced by factors $(M_t^2/M_Z^2)^n$ ($n = 1, 2$), and employ a single definition of the EWMP, identified with s_{eff}^2 . In particular, $\hat{s}^2$ can be expressed in terms of s_{eff}^2 by means of the relation

$$s_{eff}^2 = \left[1 + \frac{\hat{e}^2}{\hat{s}^2} \Delta \hat{k}(M_Z^2, \mu) \right] \hat{s}^2(\mu), \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta \hat{k}(q^2, \mu)$ is an electroweak form factor [11]. The analysis leads to the expression [6]:

$$\Delta r_{eff} = \Delta \hat{r}_W - \frac{e^2}{s_{eff}^2} \left[\Delta \hat{\rho} - \Delta \hat{k} \left(1 - \frac{s_{eff}^2}{c_{eff}^2} \right) \right] - \frac{e^2}{s_{eff}^2} x_t \left[2\Delta \hat{\rho} - (\Delta \hat{\rho})_{lead} - \hat{f} + \Delta \hat{k} \frac{s_{eff}^2}{c_{eff}^2} \right], \quad (3)$$

*Talk presented at the International Symposium Radcor 2002, September 8-13, Kloster Banz, Germany. This work was supported in part by NSF Grant No. PHY-0070787.

where

$\Delta\hat{\rho} \equiv \text{Re} [A_{WW}(M_W^2) - \hat{c}^2 A_{ZZ}(M_Z^2)] / M_W^2$,
 $x_t = 3G_F M_t^2 / (8\sqrt{2}\pi^2)$, $\Delta\hat{r}_W = -2\delta e/e + (e^2/\hat{s}^2)\hat{f}$, $(\Delta\hat{\rho})_{lead} = (3/64\pi^2) M_t^2/M_W^2$,
 $\hat{f} \equiv (\text{Re} A_{WW}(M_W^2) - A_{WW}(0)) / M_W^2 + V_W + M_W^2 B_W$, A_{WW} and A_{ZZ} are the W and Z self-energies modulo a factor $\hat{e}^2/\hat{s}^2$, V_W and B_W are vertex and box corrections contributing to μ -decay, and δe stands for the charge renormalization counterterm. It is understood that, in Eq. (3), $\hat{s}^2$ is replaced everywhere by s_{eff}^2 . The corrections $\Delta\hat{r}_W$, $\Delta\hat{\rho}$, $\Delta\hat{k}$, and $\hat{f}$ depend also on $c^2 = M_W^2/M_Z^2$. In order to obtain an expression that depends solely on $c_{eff}^2 = 1 - s_{eff}^2$, M_W^2 is replaced by $c^2 M_Z^2$; in two-loop contributions, c^2 is replaced by c_{eff}^2 , since the difference is of third order; in one-loop corrections, a Taylor expansion about $c^2 = c_{eff}^2$ is made, in conjunction with the one-loop expression for $c^2 - c_{eff}^2$. The corresponding expression for M_W is given in Ref. [6]. An interesting feature is that the calculation of s_{eff}^2 is completely decoupled from that of M_W , while the s_{eff}^2 results are employed to calculate M_W . The results for the leptonic partial widths Γ_l of the Z have been recently obtained [12]. A detailed comparison shows that, for $M_H = 100$ GeV, the difference $|s_{eff}^2(\overline{MS}) - s_{eff}^2(EFF)|$ of the $\overline{MS}$ and EFF calculation of s_{eff}^2 is $\leq 10^{-5}$ over the range $30 \text{ GeV} \leq \mu \leq 200 \text{ GeV}$ and exhibits a maximum at $\mu \approx 70 \text{ GeV}$. In the M_W case, one finds $|M_W(\overline{MS}) - M_W(EFF)| \leq 1 \text{ MeV}$ over the range $50 \text{ GeV} \leq \mu \leq 205 \text{ GeV}$ and a maximum at $\mu \approx 100 \text{ GeV}$. At $\mu = 300 \text{ GeV}$, the differences amount to $\approx 3 \times 10^{-5}$ and 3 MeV , respectively. These findings give support to the usual choice $\mu = M_Z$ in the $\overline{MS}$ calculations of observables in the resonance region. It should be pointed out, however, that this satisfactory state of affairs holds when the corrections of $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2(M_t/M_W)^2)$ are included. If these contributions are excluded, $M_W(\overline{MS})$ is a monotonically decreasing function of μ over the range $30 \text{ GeV} \leq \mu \leq 500 \text{ GeV}$ [13], and the choice of scale is very ambiguous. In summary, the EFF approach has the virtue of eliminating the scale ambiguity which, in some cases, may create a significant theoretical uncertainty.

2. Evidence for Electroweak Bosonic Corrections

It turns out that Δr_{eff} is very sensitive to electroweak bosonic contributions (EWBC), i.e. corrections involving virtual bosons: W 's, Z , H , ϕ 's. They are subleading numerically, but very important conceptually! One way to obtain sharp evidence for these corrections is to measure Δr_{eff} . Using the current experimental value $(s_{eff}^2)_{exp} = 0.23149 \pm 0.00017$ and Eq.(1), we find $(\Delta r_{eff})_{exp} = 0.06047 \pm 0.00048$. On the other hand, subtracting the EWBC, the theoretical evaluation leads to: $(\Delta r_{eff})_{theor}^{subtr} = 0.05106 \pm 0.00083$. The difference is 0.00941 ± 0.00096 , thus providing evidence for the presence of EWBC at the 9.8σ level [5,8,14]!

3. The Higgs-less Scenario

The corrections Δr_{eff} and Δr have been also employed to discuss the scale of new physics in a hypothetical scenario in which the Higgs boson is absent [15]. At the one-loop level, the Higgs boson contribution to Δr_{eff} is a complicated function of $\xi = M_H^2/M_Z^2$, given in Ref. [15]. It may be written in the form

$$(\Delta r_{eff})_H = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi\hat{s}^2\hat{c}^2} \left(\frac{5}{3} - \frac{3}{2}c^2 \right) \times \left(\frac{1}{n-4} + C + \ln \frac{M_Z}{\mu} \right) + (\Delta r_{eff})_H^{\overline{MS}}, \quad (4)$$

where the first term is the divergent part and the second one is the $\overline{MS}$ -renormalized contribution evaluated at $\mu = M_Z$ ($C = [\gamma - \ln 4\pi]/2$, $\mu = 't \text{ Hooft scale}$). Subtracting $(\Delta r_{eff})_H$ from Δr_{eff} we have

$$\Delta r_{eff} - (\Delta r_{eff})_H = \Delta r_{eff} - (\Delta r_{eff})_H^{\overline{MS}} - \frac{\alpha}{4\pi\hat{s}^2\hat{c}^2} \left(\frac{5}{3} - \frac{3}{2}c^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n-4} + C + \ln \frac{M_Z}{\mu} \right). \quad (5)$$

Clearly, Eq.(5) is divergent and scale dependent. We now conjecture that contributions from unknown new physics (NP) cancel the divergence and scale dependence of Eq.(5). Thus, the NP contribution to Δr_{eff} must be of the form:

$$X = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi\hat{s}^2\hat{c}^2} \left(\frac{5}{3} - \frac{3}{2}c^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n-4} + C + \ln \frac{M}{\mu} \right). \quad (6)$$

We note that in the $\overline{MS}$ renormalization approach, the term proportional to $\ln M/\mu$ represents the NP contribution to Δr_{eff} at scale μ . If the NP is characterized by a scale Λ , we may decompose

$$\ln \frac{M}{\mu} = \ln \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} + K, \quad (7)$$

where the term involving $K \equiv \ln \frac{M}{\Lambda}$ represents the NP contribution to Δr_{eff} at scale Λ . Adding X to $\Delta r_{eff} - (\Delta r_{eff})_H$ we find the expression for Δr_{eff} in the new scenario (NS) in which the Higgs boson contribution has been replaced by new physics:

$$(\Delta r_{eff})_{NS} = \Delta r_{eff} - (\Delta r_{eff})_H^{\overline{MS}} + \frac{\alpha}{4\pi\hat{s}^2\hat{c}^2} \left(\frac{5}{3} - \frac{3}{2}c^2 \right) \ln \frac{M}{M_Z}. \quad (8)$$

The last term represents the NP contribution to Δr_{eff} at scale M_Z . Calculating $\Delta r_{eff} - (\Delta r_{eff})_H^{\overline{MS}}$ and equating $(\Delta r_{eff})_{NS} = (\Delta r_{eff})_{exp}$, we can determine $\ln \frac{M}{M_Z}$. Employing $\Delta\alpha_h^{(5)} = 0.02761 \pm 0.00036$ and the other experimental inputs, one finds

$$\ln \frac{M}{M_Z} = 0.307 \pm 0.485, \quad (9)$$

which corresponds to a central value $M_c = 124$ GeV and a 95% CL upper bound $M^{95} = 275$ GeV. If the model-dependent constant K is positive, we see from Eq.(7) that Λ is sharply bounded: $\Lambda \leq 275$ GeV @ 95% CL. Instead, if $K < 0$, Λ is not bounded by these considerations. Thus, we can group the NP models into two classes, according to the sign of K . Furthermore, if for instance $\Lambda = 1$ TeV, we have $\ln \frac{\Lambda}{M_Z} = 2.395$ and we find from Eqs.(7,9) that $K = -2.088 \pm 0.435$. Thus, for such Λ values, a substantial cancellation of logarithmic and constant terms is required [15,16]. Similar results are obtained from the corresponding analysis of Δr [15].

4. Simple formulae for s_{eff}^2 , M_W , Γ_l

Simple formulae that reproduce accurately the numerical results of the codes in the range

$20 \text{ GeV} \leq M_H \leq 300 \text{ GeV}$, probed by recent experiments, have been presented [12]. They are of the form:

$$s_{eff}^2 = (s_{eff}^2)_0 + c_1 A_1 + c_5 A_1^2 + c_2 A_2 - c_3 A_3 + c_4 A_4, \quad (10)$$

$$M_W = M_W^0 - d_1 A_1 - d_5 A_1^2 - d_2 A_2 + d_3 A_3 - d_4 A_4, \quad (11)$$

$$\Gamma_l = \Gamma_l^0 - g_1 A_1 - g_5 A_1^2 - g_2 A_2 + g_3 A_3 - g_4 A_4, \quad (12)$$

where $A_1 \equiv \ln(M_H/100 \text{ GeV})$, $A_2 \equiv [\Delta\alpha_h^{(5)}/0.02761] - 1$, $A_3 \equiv (M_t/174.3 \text{ GeV})^2 - 1$, $A_4 \equiv [\alpha_s(M_Z)/0.118] - 1$. The constants c_i , d_i , g_i ($i = 1 - 5$) are given in Ref. [12] for the EFF, $\overline{MS}$, and OS schemes of renormalization. Furthermore, Eqs.(10-12) retain their accuracy over the range of $\Delta\alpha_h^{(5)}$ results from recent calculations. Using Eq. (10) in the EFF scheme and $(s_{eff}^2)_{exp} = 0.23149 \pm 0.00017$, one finds $M_H = 124_{-52}^{+82}$ GeV and a 95% CL upper bound $M_H^{95} = 280$ GeV. Instead, Eq. (11) and $(M_W)_{exp} = 80.451 \pm 0.033$ GeV lead to $M_H = 23_{-23}^{+49}$ GeV, $M_H^{95} = 122$ GeV. Thus, M_W constrains M_H much more sharply than s_{eff}^2 ! It is important to note that the M_H^{95} value derived from M_W , and the direct exclusion bound $M_H > 114 \text{ GeV}$ @ 95% CL, suggest a very narrow window for M_H ! One may also extract A_1 from $(s_{eff}^2)_{exp}$ and Eq. (10), to predict M_W via Eq. (11): $(M_W)_{indir.} = 80.374 \pm 0.025$ GeV, which is close to the corresponding value $(M_W)_{indir.} = 80.379 \pm 0.023$ GeV obtained in the global analysis [17], and differs from $(M_W)_{exp.}$ by 1.86σ . Finally, we may use simultaneously Eq. (10-12) in conjunction with $(s_{eff}^2)_{exp}$, $(M_W)_{exp}$, and $(\Gamma_l)_{exp}$ to obtain $M_H = 97_{-41}^{+66}$ GeV, $M_H^{95} = 223$ GeV, to be compared with $M_H = 85_{-34}^{+54}$ GeV, $M_H^{95} = 196$ GeV in the recent EWWG fit.

The current determination of $(s_{eff}^2)_{exp}$ has $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 10.6/5$, corresponding to a CL of only 6%, and shows an intriguing dichotomy: the leptonic observables $(A_l(SLD), A_l(P_\tau), A_{fb}^{(0,l)})$ lead to $(s_{eff}^2)_l = 0.23113 \pm 0.00021$, while the value from the hadronic ones $(A_{fb}^{(0,b)}, A_{fb}^{(0,c)}, < Q_{fb} >)$ is $(s_{eff}^2)_h = 0.23220 \pm 0.00029$. Thus, there

is a 3σ difference between the two determinations! Furthermore, from $(s_{eff}^2)_l$ one finds $M_H = 59_{-29}^{+50}$ GeV, $M_H^{95} = 158$ GeV, closer to the result from $(M_W)_{exp}$. If $(s_{eff}^2)_l - (s_{eff}^2)_h$ reflects a statistical fluctuation, one possibility is to enlarge the error by $[\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}]^{1/2}$ (PDG prescription), leading to $s_{eff}^2 = 0.23149 \pm 0.00025$. Interestingly, increasing the error in s_{eff}^2 leads to smaller M_H^{95} in the combined s_{eff}^2 - M_W - Γ_l analysis: $223 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow 201 \text{ GeV}$! The reason is that this procedure gives enhanced weight to the M_W input, which prefers a smaller M_H . If $(s_{eff}^2)_l - (s_{eff}^2)_h$ is due to new physics involving the (t, b) generation, a substantial, tree-level change in the $Zb_R\bar{b}_R$ coupling is required [18]. If the discrepancy were to settle on the leptonic side, a scenario with light $\tilde{\nu}$ and $\tilde{g}$ would improve the agreement with the electroweak data and the direct lower bound on M_H [19].

It has been pointed out by several people that, if the central values of M_t and M_W remain as they are now, but the errors shrink sharply as expected at Tevatron/LHC or even much better at LC + GigaZ, a discrepancy would be established with the SM, that can be accommodated in the MSSM!

The comparison of the calculations of s_{eff}^2 , M_W , and Γ_l in the EFF, $\overline{MS}$, and OS frameworks has been applied to study the scheme dependence and to estimate the theoretical error arising from the truncation of the perturbative series [12]. Including QCD uncertainties, the theoretical errors have been estimated to be $\delta s_{eff}^2 \approx 6 \times 10^{-5}$ and $\delta M_W \approx 7 \text{ MeV}$.

5. Field Renormalization Constant for Unstable Particles

In Ref. [20] it was found that, in the gauge theory context, the conventional definitions of mass and width of unstable particles are gauge dependent in next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO). Furthermore, the conventional expression for the field renormalization constant tends to 0 as the particle mass approaches from below some physical thresholds, which implies the absurd conclusion that, in such a case, all decays are forbidden.

In Ref. [20], it was proposed that the first problem can be solved by considering the complex valued position $\bar{s}$ of the propagator's pole, which is gauge invariant. We have: $\bar{s} = M_o^2 + A(\bar{s})$, where M_o is the bare mass and $A(s)$ the self-energy. Decomposing $\bar{s} = m_2^2 - im_2\Gamma_2$, where m_2 and Γ_2 are real, one identifies m_2 and Γ_2 with the mass and width of the particle:

$$m_2^2 = M_o^2 + \text{Re } A(\bar{s}), \quad (13)$$

$$m_2\Gamma_2 = -\text{Im } A(\bar{s}). \quad (14)$$

In Ref.[21], it was proposed that the second problem can be solved by defining the field renormalization constant $\hat{Z}$ by means of the normalization condition

$$m_2\Gamma_2 = -\hat{Z}\text{Im } A(m_2^2), \quad (15)$$

which, in conjunction with Eq. (14), leads to

$$\hat{Z}^{-1} = 1 + \frac{\text{Im } (A(\bar{s}) - A(m_2^2))}{m_2\Gamma_2}. \quad (16)$$

In the narrow width approximation, the r.h.s. of Eq. (16) becomes $1 - \text{Re } A'(m_2^2) \approx 1 - \text{Re } A'(M^2)$, where M^2 is the on-shell mass, and $\hat{Z}$ reduces to the conventional expression. We note that: i) $\hat{Z}$, defined by Eq. (16), involves a finite difference, rather than a derivative, thus avoiding the threshold problem; ii) using Eq. (16) we see that the r.h.s. of Eq. (15) is gauge invariant, since it equals $m_2\Gamma_2$ as a mathematical identity. It was also shown that the use of Eq. (16) removes unphysical threshold singularities in the relation between on-shell and pole widths [22]. This approach has been recently discussed in the framework of renormalization theory [23,24]. Dividing the unrenormalized transverse propagator $-iQ_{\mu\nu}[s - M_o^2 - A(s)]^{-1}$ ($Q_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - q_\mu q_\nu/q^2$) by $\hat{Z}$, and introducing $S(s) \equiv \hat{Z}A(s)$, $\delta M^2 \equiv \text{Re } S(\bar{s})$, $\hat{Z} \equiv 1 - \delta\hat{Z}$, we obtain the renormalized propagator:

$$\mathcal{D} = -iQ_{\mu\nu}/(s - m_2^2 - S^{(r)}(s)), \quad (17)$$

where

$$S^{(r)}(s) = S(s) - \delta M^2 + \delta\hat{Z}(s - m_2^2) \quad (18)$$

stands for the renormalized self-energy. Since δM^2 and $\delta\hat{Z}$ are real, they should be chosen so

that $Re S^{(r)}(s)$ is ultraviolet convergent to all orders. Once this is done, $Im S^{(r)}(s) = Im S(s) = \hat{Z} Im A(s)$ must also be convergent, since there are no additional counterterms available. This means that $\hat{Z}$ may be defined by imposing an appropriate normalization condition on $Im S(s)$. A particularly simple one is

$$Im S(m_2^2) = -m_2 \Gamma_2, \quad (19)$$

which coincides with Eq. (15)! It was proposed independently in Ref. [21] to solve the threshold and gauge-dependence problems, and in Ref. [24] to implement a systematic order by order removal of the ultraviolet divergences in $S^{(r)}(s)$. In Ref. [23] it was also emphasized that in this formulation one can derive closed and exact expressions for the mass and field-renormalization counterterms, to wit

$$\delta M^2 = Re S(\overline{s}); \delta \hat{Z} = \frac{Im [S(\overline{s}) - S(m_2^2)]}{m_2 \Gamma_2}. \quad (20)$$

In many cases, $\Gamma_2 = \mathcal{O}(g^2)$, where g is a generic gauge coupling. If δM^2 and $\delta \hat{Z}$ admit expansions in powers of Γ_2 , they can be expressed as series involving $R \equiv Re S(s)$, $I \equiv Im S(s)$, and their powers and derivatives evaluated at $s = m_2^2$. These expansions of Eq. (20) coincide with the order by order analysis in Ref. [24]. However, in other important instances, such as the photonic corrections to the W self-energy, such expansions are ill-defined and lead to power-like infrared divergences! In such cases one should employ the exact formulae in Eq. (20), which lead to sensible expressions for δM^2 , $\delta \hat{Z}$, and the renormalized propagator [23].

REFERENCES

1. A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 971 (1980).
2. K. I. Aoki, Z. Hioki, M. Konuma, R. Kawabe and T. Muta, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **73**, 1 (1982).
3. A. Hollik, Fortsh. Phys. **38**, 165 (1990), and refs. cited therein.
4. See, for example, G. Degrassi, S. Fanchiotti and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B351**, 49 (1991), and refs. cited therein.
5. A. Sirlin, hep-ph/0209079, to be published in Journal of Physics G.
6. A. Ferroglia, G. Ossola and A. Sirlin, Phys. Lett. **B507**, 147 (2001).
7. A. Ferroglia, G. Ossola and A. Sirlin, *Novel Approach to Renormalize the Electroweak Sector of the Standard Model*, Contribution to the 20th International Symposium on Lepton and Photon Interactions at High Energies, Rome, Italy, July 2001, arXiv:hep-ph/0106094.
8. A. Sirlin, *Proc. of the 19th Intl. Symp. on Photon and Lepton Interactions at High Energy LP99*, ed. J.A. Jaros and M.E. Peskin, 398 (2000).
9. G. Degrassi, P. Gambino and A. Vicini, Phys. Lett. B **383**, 219 (1996).
10. G. Degrassi, P. Gambino and A. Sirlin, Phys. Lett. **B394**, 188 (1997).
11. P. Gambino and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D49**, R1160 (1994).
12. A. Ferroglia, G. Ossola, M. Passera and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 113002 (2002).
13. G. Degrassi, P. Gambino, M. Passera, and A. Sirlin, Phys. Lett. **B418**, 209 (1998).
14. P. Gambino and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 621 (1994).
15. B. A. Kniehl and A. Sirlin, Eur. Phys. J. **C16** 635 (2000).
16. G. Altarelli, arXiv:hep-ph/9912291.
17. G. Myatt, LEP and SLD Electroweak Working Group, Preliminary [03-15-02].
18. W.J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 093006 (1999); M. S. Chanowitz, Report LBNL-43248, arXiv:hep-ph/9905478.
19. G. Altarelli, F. Caravaglios, G. F. Giudice, P. Gambino and G. Ridolfi, JHEP **0106**, 018 (2001).
20. A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2127 (1991).
21. B. A. Kniehl, C. P. Palisoc and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. B **591**, 296 (2000).
22. B. A. Kniehl, C. P. Palisoc and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 057902 (2002).
23. B. A. Kniehl and A. Sirlin, Phys. Lett. B **530**, 129 (2002).
24. M. L. Nekrasov, Phys. Lett. B **531**, 225 (2002).